

Application No.: 09/484,865
Group Art Unit: 2195

REMARKS

The Examiner stated this final action is in response to the Appeal Brief filed on July 19, 2005.

“Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and were found to be persuasive and prosecution is reopened based on the new grounds of rejections.

Claims 1-4, 7-16, and 19-50 are presented for examination.”

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner shows the Office Action of October 4, 2005, as non-final. In the Detailed Action text above, the Examiner refers to this Office Action as a “final” Office Action. This is a non-final Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that claims 1-4, 7-16, and 19-25 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

This has been done.

The Examiner stated further that claims 27, 30-32, 34-36, 39, 42-44, and 46-48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

This has been done.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

Claims 1-25, 30-32, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Application No.: 09/484,865
Group Art Unit: 2195

The Examiner states:

"In claim 1, "the microdevices" (line 2) lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner recommends deleting "the".

In claim 1, "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 15) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 16) are indefinite because in lines 17-18 and 19-20, these limitations seem to be redundant. It is unclear whether the processing of these parameters is done twice, for example. The Examiner recommends simply deleting the terms "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 15) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 16)."

The Examiner's recommendation has been followed and the rejection is now moot.

The Examiner states:

"In claim 13, similarly to claim 1, "the programmable microdevices" (line 4) lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner recommends deleting "the".

In claim 13, similarly to claim 1, "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 15) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 16) are indefinite because in lines 17-18 and 19-20, these limitations seem to be redundant. It is unclear whether the processing of these parameters is done twice, for example. The Examiner recommends simply deleting the terms "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 15) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 16)."

The Examiner's recommendation has been followed and the rejection is now moot.

The Examiner states:

"In claim 30, similarly to claim 1, "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 2) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 3) are indefinite because in lines 4-5 and 6-7, these limitations seem to be redundant. It is unclear whether the processing of these parameters is done twice, for example. The Examiner recommends simply deleting the terms "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 2) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 3)."

The Examiner's recommendation has been followed and the rejection is now moot.

Application No.: 09/484,865
Group Art Unit: 2195

The Examiner states:

"In claim 42, similarly to claim 1, "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 2) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 3) are indefinite because in lines 4-5 and 6-7, these limitations seem to be redundant. It is unclear whether the processing of these parameters is done twice, for example. The Examiner recommends simply deleting the terms "providing processing system setup and shutdown parameters" (line 2) and "providing processing system process-specific parameters" (line 3)."

The Examiner's recommendation has been followed and the rejection is now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 26, 28, 38, 40, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Willis, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,815 B1, hereinafter "Willis").

These claims have been canceled and the rejections are now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 29, 37, 41, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,815 B1, hereinafter "Willis") in view of McNabb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,462 B1, hereinafter "McNabb").

These claims have been canceled and the rejections are now moot.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Allowance of claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-25, 27, 30-32, 34-36, 39, 42-44, and 46-48 at an early date is solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0374 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Application No.: 09/484,865
Group Art Unit: 2195

Respectfully submitted,



Mikio Ishimaru
Registration No. 27,449

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru
333 W. El Camino Real, Suite 330
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
Telephone: (408) 738-0592
Fax: (408) 738-0881
Date: March 6, 2006